

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/911,969

Applicant(s)

KAWAMURA ET AL.

Examiner

Larry R. Helms

Art Unit

1642

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Larry R. Helms.

(3) _____

(2) Ms. Lombillo.

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 24 June 2003.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: claims 19 and 8.

Identification of prior art discussed: none.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed with Ms. Lombillo that if the term "isolated" was added to the nucleotide in claim 19 and the host cell in claim 8 the claims would be in condition for allowance. Ms Lombillo did not want to add "isolated" to the host cell of claim 8 even after the examiner advised her that the vector can be a retrovirus and adding this to a host cell reads broadly on a host cell that is a transgenic animal which could be a human. Ms Lombillo stated that she needed to consider this and wanted an Office Action to state the rejection. The examiner agreed that an Office Action will be sent out .